

Interview Summary

Application No.

11/184,299

Applicant(s)

KIM, KI IL

Examiner

THIEN T. MAI

Art Unit

2887

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) THIEN T. MAI.(3) Seung Hyun, Jang.(2) Steve Kim.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 January 2010

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 28-65.

Identification of prior art discussed: Takada, Nishimura.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Thien T Mai/
Examiner, Art Unit 2887

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed Rule 132 affidavit filed 12/16/009. The Examiner informed Applicant that after consultation with supervisor Steve Paik 1/11/10, the declarations in the affidavit are considered persuasive and the specification supports the figure; thus, the Examiner will enter Fig. 6 as new drawing. Figs. 6 and 7 of Takada were discussed. The Examiner pointed out that the socket opening comprises items that are inside the space defined by items 19 and 5. Thus item 33, which is inside the opening, creates an asymmetrical shape of the opening; therefore the current rejection in view of Takada is maintained. The Examiner disagreed indicating allowability previously of claim 56 with limitation "the pin be engaged with a hole of the memory card". Applicant agreed to consider further amending claim 56 to indicate the hole is located on an inside surface of the card and combine the limitations of claim 56 to independent claims. The Examiner did not indicate allowability to any claims. Mr. Kim indicated that Applicant was contacted and approved for interview participation of Mr. Seung Hyun, Jang.